REMARKS

So that the references cited in the International Search Report will be listed on the patent granted on the present U.S. application, Applicant encloses a Form PTO/SB/08 A & B listing these references.

With respect to the Office Action at page 2, paragraph 3, the undersigned attorney on February 28 and March 1, 2005 conducted several telephone interviews with Examiner Poker and her supervisor, and was advised that the allegedly missing drawings are, in fact, in the PTO file wrapper; however, if a duplicate set of drawings is required, Applicant will be happy to supply same.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, in light of the above corrective amendments to claims specified in paragraphs 5 and 6 on page 3 of the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-24 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over EP '134 (Yoshizawa).

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice.

The independent parent claim 1 has been amended to limit it to the treatment of "**only a single** thin brittle metal strip...", and to insert a limitation from dependent claim 13, whereby the independent parent claim 1 is limited to the treatment of only one strip made of a nonocrystalline alloy.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims are both novel and non-obvious with respect to the teaching of Yoshizawa.

More specifically, according to claim 1:

a) a thin brittle strip made of nanocrystalline alloy (i.e., after heat treatment),

b) is covered, at least on one side, by an adhesive coating layer made of at least one polymer film, modifying the deformation and fracture properties of the thin metal strip, and

c) the covered strip is subjected to stresses (the strip being brittle).

In Yoshizawa, the process is clearly described only in the examples.

According to examples 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Yoshizawa,

a) a thin strip made of an amorphous alloy (such an alloy is never brittle),

b) is coated with colloidal silica or lithium silicate or alumina (none of which is a polymer),

c) then is cut (subjected to stresses -- the strip being not brittle),

d) then is subjected to a heat treatment in order to become nanocrystalline, and

e) next, laminated.

According to example 6,

a) a thin strip made of an amorphous alloy is heat treated in order to become nanocrystalline,

b) a lot of the thin strips (nanocrystalline) are laminated and bonded with an epoxy resin to form a laminate of about 12 mm), and

c) the laminate is cut.

Clearly, the process according to claim 1 is completely different from the process disclosed by Yoshizawa. Moreover, the purpose of the coating according to claim 1, which is to render posslbe the cutting of a brittle nanocrystalline strip, is not even remotely suggested by Yoshizawa (or by the other cited references).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the independent process claims and the claims dependent thereon.

The independent "magnetic component" claim 25 has been amended to limit the polymer material of the film to material which excludes the "epoxy resin" disclosed in Yoshizawa, whereby, Applicant respectfully submits, claim 23 and its dependent claims 24, 27 and 28 (and also claims 25 and 26) would not have been obvious from Yoshizawa's disclosure.

To overcome the rejection of claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Yoshizawa in view of EP '812 (Yoshizawa et al) and further in view of Schafer '860. Applicant encloses a certified English translation of Applicant's French priority application 99/00521 whose priority filing date of **January 19, 1999** is **earlier** than the effective date of Schafer '860 which, thus, is **disqualifled** as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103.

Applicant has rewritten claim 25 (25/23) in independent form, whereby Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and to **allow** claims 25 and 26.

Applicant's has amended claim 29 to make it dependent on claim 1, whereby claim 29 should be allowable (novel and non-obvious) at least for the same reason that claim 1 should be allowed.

Applicant has also added a new dependent claim 30 (30/16) to recapture limitations deleted from claim 16 by the above amendments.

Applicant has rewritten allowable claim 7 (7/3/2/1) in independent form, whereby claim 7 now should be **allowed**.

In summary, then, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the requirement for "corrected drawings", and the statutory rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 103(a), and to find the application to be in condition for allowance with all of claims 1-17 and 20-30; however, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, she is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant files concurrently herewith an Excess Claim Fee Payment Letter for one additional excess independent claim.

Applicant also files concurrently herewith a Petition (with fee) for an Extension of Time of One Month. Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any

additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

Date: March 31, 2005